

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/902,359	07/10/2001	Arthur D. Kranzley	AP33353-070457.1041	8872	
21003 75	590 10/13/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BAKER & BOTTS 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			GREENE, DANIEL L		
NEW YORK,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3621		
			DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004	DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/902,359	KRANZLEY ET AL.	CK
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	7
	Daniel L. Greene	3621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officianely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	roved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449)		
10. ☐ Other:		JAIDES P. TRA SUPERVISORY PATER TECK!!!	AT EXAMINED

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant made no changes to the claims but instead argued that the references did not disclose or suggest authorization approval be returned to the merchant's computer by the payment gateway without first obtaining authorization from the issuer. The Examiner directs the Applicant to Schenkler, Fig. 7 and related description.